

Minutes from January 12, 2005

CBS Bureau Communication/Scheduling Meeting

Attendees: NIST: Wendy Wiles, Sarah Tuohy, Mathew Grow, Pat Grimes, Sharon Nystrom, and Scott Montgomery
NOAA: Steven Brunvoll and Bill Holdsworth
EDA: Ghee Tara
Census: Avis Merkl
CSC: Amy Sommerville, Patricia Jackson (facilitator), Sue Masser, Lillian Yeh, Jeff Martin, John Sansing, Bruce Henshel, Gordon Alston, Karen McBride, and Lynn Goodrich

Date/Time: January 12, 2005, 2:00 to 4:00 pm

Purpose: User Communication and Scheduling Discussion

Major Topics discussed are summarized below:

1. CBS Master Communication/Scheduling Plan
 - a. **Status of the Draft CBS Master Communication/Scheduling Plan** - The delivery dates for the 2005 Initiatives and continuing projects were discussed. See Attachment 1.a Draft CBS Master Scheduling Plan to Include Bureau Implementation. As none of the 2005 initiatives have approved project plans, the dates cited in the Scheduling Plan are estimated dates. During the meeting, the Bureaus indicated estimated dates as to when they would be able to promote the code to their production environments. The Scheduling Plan has been updated to include those projected dates. The Bureaus had numerous questions concerning the status of the various projects, those questions are documented below.

Bureau Questions Asked During the Meeting

Description	Responsibility	CSC Response Being Provided After the Meeting
Open Action Items from Jan 12 meeting		
10. SF 224 Question – will bureaus have to use the SF 224 report in CFS for their SF 224 reporting.	Joe Burkot/Jeff Martin	Per Bob Bair (in Program Managers Meeting on 1/13/05) the answer is yes, and thus an implementation date needs to be agreed to.
11. CSTARS is to be delivered on Mar 2 and SF224 on Mar 2, because of the time it will take to implement CSTARS, SF 224 needs to be delivered first. The same is the case with Prior Year Adjustment Phase II, Bureaus want it delivered before CSTARS.	SF 224 - Joe Burkot/Jeff Martin Sue Masser - PY Adjustments Phase II	Attempts are being made to deliver SF 224 before CSTARS. PY Adjustments Phase II can not be delivered before the planned CSTARS delivery date of March. PY Adjustments Phase II will be ready for delivery later in March.
CCR questions –	Jerry Rorstrom-Lee	The CCR Project Team is developing a communication paper to address the testing and deployment of CCR. Bureaus should be testing Phase 1 of CCR. Code changes have been made that will allow this.
12. Is the CCR code as delivered ready to be tested or is it dependent on some of the ARs delivered shortly afterward.		See Executive Board Project Status for Jan. 24 Meeting, page 5 for detailed description of phases and projected delivery schedules. The following exert responds to the questions:
13. How many more ARs will we receive in the near future, and how significant are they?		Phase 1: The Phase 1 programming was completed and delivered on December 20, 2004. This delivery also included elements of the Phase 2 code needed by the CSTARS development team. The inclusion of the Phase 2 code has interfered with the bureau's ability to complete testing and roll-out of the Phase 1 code. The OFM/CSC will deliver a patch for the Phase 1 delivery to disconnect the Phase 2 portion of the
14. When should Bureaus start the testing, should they wait for additional ARs.		

Bureau Questions Asked During the Meeting

Description	Responsibility	CSC Response Being Provided After the Meeting
15. NOAA expressed concern about the quality of the testing effort, pointing out that the FRD does not match the delivered code and thus the difficulty they are expecting with their testing effort.		code and allow the roll-out of the Phase 1 code to be completed as a normal release. This patch will be delivered in January as a Level 1 action. Phase 2: The final elements of the Phase 2 code will be delivered by the end of January. This code is currently under test at the OFM CSC. Once the final elements of the Phase 2 code are ready, Bureaus will conduct the bureau level testing for the Phase 2 Code and the vendor data clean-up/Reconciliation operations in special preproduction environments at each bureau site. This will allow the clean-up/operations to be conducted in parallel with other CFS enhancement deliveries without interfering with the current normal operations of the CFS. During late January and early February, the OFM CSC will complete the CCR roll-out planning with each bureau and will conduct training for the bureau data clean-up teams. The first planning work sessions have already been held with NIST and Census and will be completed with NOAA during the week of January 23 rd . We expect the data clean-up operations to begin in early February at each bureau. Phase 3: The design for the Phase Code delivery will start once the CCR Phase 1 and Phase 2 roll-out actions have been completed. Once the design has been completed, the schedule for programming, testing and, delivery of this code will be set by the Bureau Scheduling team - taking into consideration any end of year priority changes that may arise. Issues: Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the CCR project must be completed before bureaus can begin the CSTARS interface roll-out. It is expected that the CCR Phase 2 effort will take from 6 to 8 weeks. Project Team is researching response.
16. Need a schedule and scope for the additional ARs and any additional phases to the CCR effort (API).		
17. Can the CCR code be installed before all of the data is fixed for CCR?		
CSTARS questions –	Jerry	

Bureau Questions Asked During the Meeting

Description	Responsibility	CSC Response Being Provided After the Meeting
18. Could a Bureau promote the CSTARS Code and not implement the application, thus not use it right away?	Rorstrom-Lee	
19. What is the Department's position on implementing CSTARS this FY.		The CIO Office position is that CSTARS will be implemented this FY.
20. Will all bureaus have to implement the CSTARS code at the same time or not be able to make awards?		Project Team is researching response.
21. Web Integration document has not been updated on the web, it still shows the draft document and per the project status report, Accenture provided the final Web Integration DLD document on 11/8/04.		This document is still in draft as the Government has not accepted the DLD as provided by Accenture as it provides two implementation approaches.
E-Travel Questions –	Karen	Project Team is researching responses to the specific questions. A meeting was held on Feb 2 to explore alternatives; however final decisions have not been made.
22. Could we look at implementing in phases with possibly only implementing the reservation functionality this FY?	McBride	
23. What CSC/Bureau development effort will be necessary to implement the e-travel interface?		General Status: The E-Travel team is looking to deliver the E-Travel interface a year early. If this schedule is implemented, the E-Travel project will need to be factored into the existing CBS project delivery timelines.
24. Can the implementation dates be		

Bureau Questions Asked During the Meeting

Description	Responsibility	CSC Response Being Provided After the Meeting
<p>moved to next year?</p> <p>Trial Enhancements Questions –</p> <p>25. Bureaus Communication/Scheduling Representatives don't seem to understand the impact of the trial enhancements being considered for Phase 1. Explain how the changes are being made and what the impact will be?</p> <p>26. Will reports pulling data from trial need to be changed if the item number and fund code fields are changed?</p> <p>27. Will CFS reports need to be changed?</p> <p>28. How extensive will be testing effort be?</p> <p>29. What will be the impact to DW?</p> <p>30. Erroneous Payment Report – what priority level should be assigned to this effort?</p>	<p>John Sansing/Karen McBride</p>	<p>The Trial Enhancement changes will not impact the bureau reports or the current CFS reports. The Functional Requirements Document has been issued in draft on Jan 19th, this should address the concerns.</p> <p>General Status:</p> <p>Phase 1: Expand the trial table structure to add, remove and change the existing data elements to accommodate new reporting and processing requirements for General Ledger Level Data. Phase Deliverable: install the new Trial Table structure in the production environment without making any changes to the data that is captured in the table.</p> <p>The draft Requirement document was released for comment on January 19, 2005. The final requirement document is scheduled to be issued in the First Week of February. The updated Trial Table format is expected to be delivered by May. This must be installed before the budget execution module enhancements.</p> <p>Bureaus using the CBS Data Warehouse will have minimum impact, which will be handled by the CSC. Bureaus such as NOAA which takes a snapshot of Trail will need to plan for handling the Data Warehouse impact.</p> <p>This project began last April and was suspended due to changes to OFM/CSC resource priorities. The report is now in programming and will be ready for delivery in February.</p> <p>Priority level is being assigned by the OFM as this fulfills an external reporting requirement.</p>

Bureau Questions Asked During the Meeting

Description	Responsibility	CSC Response Being Provided After the Meeting
-------------	----------------	---

Bureau Recommendations to follow up

on:

- | | | |
|---|-------------|--|
| 31. Code delivery documentation would be more informative if the oracle tool was used to provide the difference in code A versus Code B (after the change). | Lillian Yeh | Issue communicated to CSC Lead, Lillian Yeh |
| 32. Deliveries should indicate what version of code they are base or built on. And provide in advance estimated delivery version #. | Lillian Yeh | Issue communicated to CSC Lead, Lillian Yeh. |

- b. Status of Bureau code in Production** - Patricia facilitated another discussion on the status of the Bureaus production code in an effort to discuss what version of code Bureaus should have implemented in production.

Attachment 1.b. Draft Discussion Document, CBS Deliveries and the Applications Impacted, Prepared for Version Support Discussion Purposes Only was provided to help facilitate the discussion.

The Bureaus expressed confusion with the CBS Bureau Configuration Spreadsheet, Attachment 1.b Page 1 as it cited the bureaus as being in the yellow and red status if they were one and two versions in production behind the CSC delivered version. Patricia indicated that she would summarize the approach discussed last month for the color coding with CSC Managements. In addition, the Bureaus expressed confusion of the different applications having different version numbers as the CBS only has one version numbering scheme. The CBS Bureau Configuration Spreadsheet cited the application status by the last version that impacted the application. Even if an application is not impacted by a version of code, all applications should be referred to as being at the latest version of code promoted, to avoid confusion.

2. AR Status and Process

A. CSC Status of ARs, Maintenance, Major Projects

- a. Status of the 2005 Initiatives and Continuing projects** - The status of the 2005 Initiatives and continuing projects were discussed. See Attachment 2A.a. CSC Project Status as of Jan 12, 2005.
- b. Current status of ARs** – Attachments 2.A.b. Status of Level 1 ARs as of 1/11/2005 was distributed to communicate the status of the 13 current level 1 ARs.
- c. ARs delivered in December** - Attachment 2.A.c. Level 1 Activity for December 2004 communicated that 17 level 1 ARs were delivered or closed unchanged during the month of December. In addition to the 32 ARs delivered in the December Maintenance release, totaled 49 ARs being delivered or closed during the month.
- d. December 15 Maintenance Release** – Patricia indicated that the December Maintenance release included 32 ARs: 15CFS ARs, 1 DW AR, and 16 CPCS ARs. In addition, the Bureaus were reminded that since the February Maintenance Release would also include incorporating the GUI Standards (per agreement from the Bureaus), fewer ARs will be included in this release.
- e.** Bureaus were reminded that some ARs on the priority list are awaiting comments or clarification from the Bureaus.

B. CSC Level 1 AR Process

- a. Patricia indicated that the CSC was working on revising the internal CSC procedures for handling the maintenance release in an effort to provide better quality assurance for the ARs and more advance notice to the Bureaus. The hope is that this effort will also attribute to the sub-committee approach being evaluated to discuss ARs being considered for the maintenance release.

Action items:

Description	Responsibility	Target Date
Action Items from Nov 9 meeting		
1. Evaluate AR form and provide recommendations for improvement.	Bureaus	Next Meeting As Time Allows
2. Determine CSC Supported Code Version, Yellow and Red Code Version	Bureaus/CSC	CSC will communicate final decision
3. Modify report distribution POC's	CSC	Completed – Implementation in process – Web file too large, looking into making several files or zip file.
4. Decide on best alternative to provide bureaus with comprehensive AR report sorted by module and number.		
5. An e-mail communicating the report changes will be sent to the individuals receiving the reports.		
6. Organize subcommittee for level 2 AR's	Bureaus/CSC	TBD
7. Communication Plan	CSC/Bureaus	TBD
8. CBS Master Scheduling Plan	CSC/Bureaus	TBD, Draft has been developed
Action Items from Dec 8 meeting		
9. Related to the Sub-committee approach being evaluated to discuss the maintenance delivery, the CSC will provide track/maintain and provide explanations as to why certain priority ARs do not make the maintenance delivery. In addition the CSC will copy Committee members on AR issues sent to the AR contacts.	CSC	E-mail Copy – Will be implemented immediately. Track/maintain and provide explanations - TBD
Open Action Items from Jan 12 meeting		
10. Provide names of those with authority to sign off on ARs	Bureaus	TBD

11. Bureaus recommended approval of the Standard or general rule that the commit statement should not be included in the script and that the log would show and image of the data before the change and what it would look like after the change, without making the change in the system. Everyone accepts that this approach would not always work.	Patricia Jackson	Completed - This will be incorporated as an SSD Requirement Standard. The requirements should state how the script should work and if the commit statement should be a part of the script.
---	------------------	--